

MRS. ARNO G. KORB TELLS HER STORY.

It Was Undertaker Herlich, She Says, Who Found the Missing Securities.

Told to Keep the Discovery Secret and Offered Money to Do So, but She Refused.

BONDS TURNED OVER TO THE FIRM.

A Conspiracy to Cheat Victor & Achelis, Which, It Appears, Was Thwarted by Mrs. Korb—She Insisted Upon Making Restitution.

Mrs. Arno G. Korb, who was willing to die with her husband on the night of December 31 last, lives at No. 126 East Fifty-fifth street. She and her husband attempted suicide together on December 24. His attempt was successful. Korb was head bookkeeper of the dry goods concern of Victor & Achelis, and it is claimed that he robbed them of \$100,000 by a series of defalcations.

So great was the confidence of the firm in Korb that no effort was made to examine his books for a few days after his death. Then the fact of the deficit came out. The matter was placed in the hands of Blumenfeld & Hirsch, lawyers. Their investigation showed that Korb had been making purchases of gilt-edged railroad bonds, amounting to upward of \$70,000. Mrs. Korb told the lawyers that there was a package she had persuaded her husband not to destroy. She was not sure where it was placed, but she thought it was in his safe.

Mrs. Korb is a petite brunette, dignified and modest, and speaks English very differently. She came to New York from Germany in August, 1891. She was then a widow with one child, and her name was Langer. On February 12, 1892, she married Korb at the City Hall, and afterward there was a church wedding.

Mrs. Korb said yesterday that when she and her husband were discovered on the night of the tragedy she was taken to the hospital and remained there two days. It was during that period that she first saw Christian Herlich, the undertaker, who had taken charge of the burial of her husband. "He called at the hospital every day," said Mrs. Korb, "and was very kind to me, so much so that a number of people there remarked upon his attention. When I was able to leave I went to No. 126 East Fifty-fifth street, where I had some friends. On Friday night Mr. Herlich came to see me and asked me if I had anything of value in my old residence. I said to him that my silver was there and told him where it was. He replied that he had a safe, and as he was responsible for everything he had better take it away and lock it up. At this call he said nothing to me about any bonds or other valuables. He had the keys of the house and had had them from the night of the tragedy.

THE BONDS FOUND. "On Saturday morning he called again and told me that he had locked up the silver in his safe and had also found some bonds between the sideboard and the wall in the corner of our room. I said I was very glad although I did not know what he meant. He laughed and said he wanted to speak with me. I asked him if he had the bonds with him and he replied that he did not, but that they were locked up in his safe and he did not know how much they amounted to. On that afternoon he came again with a carriage and said I needed some fresh air. He desired me to go driving with him, he said. I thought it might benefit me and asked a lady friend in the house to accompany us, but he said, 'Excuse me; I must speak with Mrs. Korb alone.'

"Then I went down to the carriage and we drove through the Park. While we were in the Park he took out a package, opened it and said, 'Here are the bonds. It is your property, and you must say nothing to anybody about it.' I did not know what bonds were and he had to explain them to me. He counted them on my knee and I never touched them. He counted fifty papers on my knee and said, 'It is your own property. I will explain it to you. It seems to me you cannot understand it.' I said, 'If you had brought these papers this morning, I would have turned them over to Victor & Achelis. He laughed at me and seemed to think I was a fool. He told me if any one asked me about bonds to say I knew nothing about them. He said he would explain everything the following week.

"Still I could not understand what the papers were, although we both spoke in German. I asked him why my husband had not given back the money when it amounted to so much. He always laughed at me, and then said my husband was a fool. He took the bonds away with him and said he would put them in his safe. On Sunday night I went to my former home for the first time, and was accompanied by a gentleman friend and Mr. Herlich. Mr. Herlich seemed to know the whole house. I saw that the bureau drawers were disarranged, but he knew where everything was. I had never heard my husband speak of any bonds, and never saw any, and naturally I was surprised when Mr. Herlich told me of his discovery; but he never mentioned any other sum than \$20,000 in bonds. During the interview I expressed a desire to see my husband's remains, and on Monday afternoon he called for me and took me to the cemetery. When we got there he took the hat off the coffin and I saw my husband. While on this trip Mr. Herlich again warned me not to say anything about the bonds. He said they belonged to me and that my husband had given his life for them, and they did not belong to the firm.

HERLICH'S GREAT CARE FOR HER. "I had always been surprised that he should manifest so much interest in me. He told me he was a brother Free Mason of my husband, and I thought it was for that reason he was acting so nicely. On the Saturday before he had told me that if the lady of the house where I was stopping would not keep me he would take me to a hotel where the boarders would do everything for me. He was too careful for me.

"On Tuesday morning he called here and said to me: 'Give me your word that you will not say anything about the bonds. I will do everything for you, and you will prove that the bonds belong to you.' He always advised me to say nothing to any one about the bonds, and finally said I must go to Europe for my health, and he would look out for the bonds.

"While talking last Friday to Mr. Victor, he said something about \$70,000 worth

of bonds. I did not know what he was talking about because Mr. Herlich did not say anything to me about \$70,000, and I did not say anything about the bonds Mr. Herlich had. Friday night I was feeling very sick, and the doctor gave me a powder which made me sleep until Saturday noon. When I awoke I went to Mr. Herlich to come to see me. My head was clear, and I began thinking that all was not right. I wanted to get the bonds and deliver them over to Victor & Achelis. He came, but brought with him two lawyers. Mr. Herlich again insisted that the bonds belonged to me, and the lawyers said they would save them for me. They said so much that I forgot all they said. Mr. Herlich said I must say nothing to any one, and the lawyers told me not to talk about it. I told them I would give the bonds to Victor & Achelis, and Herlich got very angry about it.

"On Sunday morning two men, whose names I do not remember, but whose card I gave to Blumenfeld & Hirsch, came to see me. They had a check for \$2,000, and said it belonged to me.

MONEY FOR HER IN BANK.

"I could not understand it, because I had not a cent when I came from the hospital. They said the check was mine and I must keep it, and that the next day I would have \$18,000, which was in the bank for me. I did not touch the check because I knew it did not belong to me. I told them I would think about it and give them an answer the next day. One of them said he would call the next morning in a carriage for me, and I said 'all right.' I was glad when they had gone. As soon as they left I went to Mr. Seidelbach, the husband of the lady of the house, and told him everything. I asked

him to see Victor & Achelis about it and tell them. He did so, and when he returned he told me he had done so. I could not bear it any longer. I felt that I must tell him all about it.

"Monday afternoon, at the office of Blumenfeld & Hirsch, I saw both George and Charles Victor. I told them the truth and signed all papers they asked me to and gave back everything. I said I would not have a cent until my husband's conduct had been made right. While I was in the office Mr. Herlich's lawyer took me into another room and told me not to sign the papers, because the bonds belonged to me. I paid no attention to him, and he afterward wanted \$500 from Victor & Achelis for his services."

Mr. Hirsch, of Blumenfeld & Hirsch, attorneys, said yesterday: "The bonds, amounting to \$70,000, have been turned over to Victor & Achelis, and the matter is ended."

It seems to me you cannot understand it. I said, 'If you had brought these papers this morning, I would have turned them over to Victor & Achelis. He laughed at me and seemed to think I was a fool. He told me if any one asked me about bonds to say I knew nothing about them. He said he would explain everything the following week.

"Still I could not understand what the papers were, although we both spoke in German. I asked him why my husband had not given back the money when it amounted to so much. He always laughed at me, and then said my husband was a fool. He took the bonds away with him and said he would put them in his safe. On Sunday night I went to my former home for the first time, and was accompanied by a gentleman friend and Mr. Herlich. Mr. Herlich seemed to know the whole house. I saw that the bureau drawers were disarranged, but he knew where everything was. I had never heard my husband speak of any bonds, and never saw any, and naturally I was surprised when Mr. Herlich told me of his discovery; but he never mentioned any other sum than \$20,000 in bonds. During the interview I expressed a desire to see my husband's remains, and on Monday afternoon he called for me and took me to the cemetery. When we got there he took the hat off the coffin and I saw my husband. While on this trip Mr. Herlich again warned me not to say anything about the bonds. He said they belonged to me and that my husband had given his life for them, and they did not belong to the firm.

HERLICH'S GREAT CARE FOR HER. "I had always been surprised that he should manifest so much interest in me. He told me he was a brother Free Mason of my husband, and I thought it was for that reason he was acting so nicely. On the Saturday before he had told me that if the lady of the house where I was stopping would not keep me he would take me to a hotel where the boarders would do everything for me. He was too careful for me.

"On Tuesday morning he called here and said to me: 'Give me your word that you will not say anything about the bonds. I will do everything for you, and you will prove that the bonds belong to you.' He always advised me to say nothing to any one about the bonds, and finally said I must go to Europe for my health, and he would look out for the bonds.

"While talking last Friday to Mr. Victor, he said something about \$70,000 worth

of bonds. I did not know what he was talking about because Mr. Herlich did not say anything to me about \$70,000, and I did not say anything about the bonds Mr. Herlich had. Friday night I was feeling very sick, and the doctor gave me a powder which made me sleep until Saturday noon. When I awoke I went to Mr. Herlich to come to see me. My head was clear, and I began thinking that all was not right. I wanted to get the bonds and deliver them over to Victor & Achelis. He came, but brought with him two lawyers. Mr. Herlich again insisted that the bonds belonged to me, and the lawyers said they would save them for me. They said so much that I forgot all they said. Mr. Herlich said I must say nothing to any one, and the lawyers told me not to talk about it. I told them I would give the bonds to Victor & Achelis, and Herlich got very angry about it.

"On Sunday morning two men, whose names I do not remember, but whose card I gave to Blumenfeld & Hirsch, came to see me. They had a check for \$2,000, and said it belonged to me.

MONEY FOR HER IN BANK.

"I could not understand it, because I had not a cent when I came from the hospital. They said the check was mine and I must keep it, and that the next day I would have \$18,000, which was in the bank for me. I did not touch the check because I knew it did not belong to me. I told them I would think about it and give them an answer the next day. One of them said he would call the next morning in a carriage for me, and I said 'all right.' I was glad when they had gone. As soon as they left I went to Mr. Seidelbach, the husband of the lady of the house, and told him everything. I asked

him to see Victor & Achelis about it and tell them. He did so, and when he returned he told me he had done so. I could not bear it any longer. I felt that I must tell him all about it.

"Monday afternoon, at the office of Blumenfeld & Hirsch, I saw both George and Charles Victor. I told them the truth and signed all papers they asked me to and gave back everything. I said I would not have a cent until my husband's conduct had been made right. While I was in the office Mr. Herlich's lawyer took me into another room and told me not to sign the papers, because the bonds belonged to me. I paid no attention to him, and he afterward wanted \$500 from Victor & Achelis for his services."

Mr. Hirsch, of Blumenfeld & Hirsch, attorneys, said yesterday: "The bonds, amounting to \$70,000, have been turned over to Victor & Achelis, and the matter is ended."

TWO CROOKS FOR \$1,000.

Detectives Gain That Reward by Arresting a Pair of Notorious Bank Sneaks.

They Are George Carson and "Sid" Yennie, Who Robbed the Patchogue, L. I., Post Office.

WERE CAPTURED IN THIS CITY.

Their Pictures Are in the Rogues' Gallery, and They Are Wanted in Several States for Different Crimes.

Acting Captain O'Brien and Detective Sergeant McCauley have added \$1,000 to their bank accounts within two days by the capture of two of the most notorious bank sneaks in the country. They are George Carson and "Sid" Yennie, and are wanted in almost every State in the Union. They were members of the notorious gang of post office robbers, Kilkoran Allen and Russell, who added materially to their professional reputations by walking out of Ludlow Street Jail on July 4 last.

The specific charge upon which Carson and Yennie have been arrested is the robbery of the Post Office at Patchogue, L. I., on June 1, 1894, when they secured \$1,700 worth of postage stamps. The Federal authorities offered a reward of \$500 each for

him to see Victor & Achelis about it and tell them. He did so, and when he returned he told me he had done so. I could not bear it any longer. I felt that I must tell him all about it.

"Monday afternoon, at the office of Blumenfeld & Hirsch, I saw both George and Charles Victor. I told them the truth and signed all papers they asked me to and gave back everything. I said I would not have a cent until my husband's conduct had been made right. While I was in the office Mr. Herlich's lawyer took me into another room and told me not to sign the papers, because the bonds belonged to me. I paid no attention to him, and he afterward wanted \$500 from Victor & Achelis for his services."

Mr. Hirsch, of Blumenfeld & Hirsch, attorneys, said yesterday: "The bonds, amounting to \$70,000, have been turned over to Victor & Achelis, and the matter is ended."

It seems to me you cannot understand it. I said, 'If you had brought these papers this morning, I would have turned them over to Victor & Achelis. He laughed at me and seemed to think I was a fool. He told me if any one asked me about bonds to say I knew nothing about them. He said he would explain everything the following week.

"Still I could not understand what the papers were, although we both spoke in German. I asked him why my husband had not given back the money when it amounted to so much. He always laughed at me, and then said my husband was a fool. He took the bonds away with him and said he would put them in his safe. On Sunday night I went to my former home for the first time, and was accompanied by a gentleman friend and Mr. Herlich. Mr. Herlich seemed to know the whole house. I saw that the bureau drawers were disarranged, but he knew where everything was. I had never heard my husband speak of any bonds, and never saw any, and naturally I was surprised when Mr. Herlich told me of his discovery; but he never mentioned any other sum than \$20,000 in bonds. During the interview I expressed a desire to see my husband's remains, and on Monday afternoon he called for me and took me to the cemetery. When we got there he took the hat off the coffin and I saw my husband. While on this trip Mr. Herlich again warned me not to say anything about the bonds. He said they belonged to me and that my husband had given his life for them, and they did not belong to the firm.

HERLICH'S GREAT CARE FOR HER. "I had always been surprised that he should manifest so much interest in me. He told me he was a brother Free Mason of my husband, and I thought it was for that reason he was acting so nicely. On the Saturday before he had told me that if the lady of the house where I was stopping would not keep me he would take me to a hotel where the boarders would do everything for me. He was too careful for me.

"On Tuesday morning he called here and said to me: 'Give me your word that you will not say anything about the bonds. I will do everything for you, and you will prove that the bonds belong to you.' He always advised me to say nothing to any one about the bonds, and finally said I must go to Europe for my health, and he would look out for the bonds.

"While talking last Friday to Mr. Victor, he said something about \$70,000 worth

of bonds. I did not know what he was talking about because Mr. Herlich did not say anything to me about \$70,000, and I did not say anything about the bonds Mr. Herlich had. Friday night I was feeling very sick, and the doctor gave me a powder which made me sleep until Saturday noon. When I awoke I went to Mr. Herlich to come to see me. My head was clear, and I began thinking that all was not right. I wanted to get the bonds and deliver them over to Victor & Achelis. He came, but brought with him two lawyers. Mr. Herlich again insisted that the bonds belonged to me, and the lawyers said they would save them for me. They said so much that I forgot all they said. Mr. Herlich said I must say nothing to any one, and the lawyers told me not to talk about it. I told them I would give the bonds to Victor & Achelis, and Herlich got very angry about it.

"On Sunday morning two men, whose names I do not remember, but whose card I gave to Blumenfeld & Hirsch, came to see me. They had a check for \$2,000, and said it belonged to me.

MONEY FOR HER IN BANK.

"I could not understand it, because I had not a cent when I came from the hospital. They said the check was mine and I must keep it, and that the next day I would have \$18,000, which was in the bank for me. I did not touch the check because I knew it did not belong to me. I told them I would think about it and give them an answer the next day. One of them said he would call the next morning in a carriage for me, and I said 'all right.' I was glad when they had gone. As soon as they left I went to Mr. Seidelbach, the husband of the lady of the house, and told him everything. I asked

him to see Victor & Achelis about it and tell them. He did so, and when he returned he told me he had done so. I could not bear it any longer. I felt that I must tell him all about it.

"Monday afternoon, at the office of Blumenfeld & Hirsch, I saw both George and Charles Victor. I told them the truth and signed all papers they asked me to and gave back everything. I said I would not have a cent until my husband's conduct had been made right. While I was in the office Mr. Herlich's lawyer took me into another room and told me not to sign the papers, because the bonds belonged to me. I paid no attention to him, and he afterward wanted \$500 from Victor & Achelis for his services."

Mr. Hirsch, of Blumenfeld & Hirsch, attorneys, said yesterday: "The bonds, amounting to \$70,000, have been turned over to Victor & Achelis, and the matter is ended."

It seems to me you cannot understand it. I said, 'If you had brought these papers this morning, I would have turned them over to Victor & Achelis. He laughed at me and seemed to think I was a fool. He told me if any one asked me about bonds to say I knew nothing about them. He said he would explain everything the following week.

THIRTY-EIGHT, VS. EIGHT.

A Hot Fight for Possession Between the Heirs to an Estate in the City of Paterson.

Cornelius Doremus and thirty-seven others have possession of a piece of property—Nos. 303 and 305 Main street, Paterson, N. J.—and Elizabeth Newell and seven others claim it. Vice-Chancellor Pitner, in Jersey City, yesterday heard argument in the case. The thirty-eight who have possession of the property came from Paterson, Union Hill and Morristown, N. J., Davenport, O., Chicago and Fort Magin, Mont. The complainants claim that their title comes from a deed for the property given by Elizabeth Newell to Martha Doremus in 1839. Martha Doremus died in 1882. Cornelius Doremus was appointed her executor with directions to sell the property and divide the proceeds among certain legatees. Some of these have died and their heirs claim their interest, and in this way the thirty-eight have taken possession.

The executor in 1890 tried to sell the property, but could not, owing to the outstanding claim of the defendants. The defendants claim that in 1851 John Magee, the owner, died, and left a life interest in it to his daughter, Mary. His widow was appointed guardian. The widow remarried, and under the name of Elizabeth Newell she bought a mortgage on the property, the defendants claim. Subsequently she gave Martha Doremus the deed under which the complainants claim the property. The daughter married, and now, as Mary Dunham, with her children, claims the property. She states that her mother simply held the property in trust for her, and that the trust still attaches to her.

That Mrs. Newell defrauded her daughter, or that there was any trust in her favor, is denied by the complainants. They have had possession of the property since 1850. The thirty-eight who have possession of the property came from Paterson, Union Hill and Morristown, N. J., Davenport, O., Chicago and Fort Magin, Mont. The complainants claim that their title comes from a deed for the property given by Elizabeth Newell to Martha Doremus in 1839. Martha Doremus died in 1882. Cornelius Doremus was appointed her executor with directions to sell the property and divide the proceeds among certain legatees. Some of these have died and their heirs claim their interest, and in this way the thirty-eight have taken possession.

The executor in 1890 tried to sell the property, but could not, owing to the outstanding claim of the defendants. The defendants claim that in 1851 John Magee, the owner, died, and left a life interest in it to his daughter, Mary. His widow was appointed guardian. The widow remarried, and under the name of Elizabeth Newell she bought a mortgage on the property, the defendants claim. Subsequently she gave Martha Doremus the deed under which the complainants claim the property. The daughter married, and now, as Mary Dunham, with her children, claims the property. She states that her mother simply held the property in trust for her, and that the trust still attaches to her.

That Mrs. Newell defrauded her daughter, or that there was any trust in her favor, is denied by the complainants. They have had possession of the property since 1850. The thirty-eight who have possession of the property came from Paterson, Union Hill and Morristown, N. J., Davenport, O., Chicago and Fort Magin, Mont. The complainants claim that their title comes from a deed for the property given by Elizabeth Newell to Martha Doremus in 1839. Martha Doremus died in 1882. Cornelius Doremus was appointed her executor with directions to sell the property and divide the proceeds among certain legatees. Some of these have died and their heirs claim their interest, and in this way the thirty-eight have taken possession.

The executor in 1890 tried to sell the property, but could not, owing to the outstanding claim of the defendants. The defendants claim that in 1851 John Magee, the owner, died, and left a life interest in it to his daughter, Mary. His widow was appointed guardian. The widow remarried, and under the name of Elizabeth Newell she bought a mortgage on the property, the defendants claim. Subsequently she gave Martha Doremus the deed under which the complainants claim the property. The daughter married, and now, as Mary Dunham, with her children, claims the property. She states that her mother simply held the property in trust for her, and that the trust still attaches to her.

That Mrs. Newell defrauded her daughter, or that there was any trust in her favor, is denied by the complainants. They have had possession of the property since 1850. The thirty-eight who have possession of the property came from Paterson, Union Hill and Morristown, N. J., Davenport, O., Chicago and Fort Magin, Mont. The complainants claim that their title comes from a deed for the property given by Elizabeth Newell to Martha Doremus in 1839. Martha Doremus died in 1882. Cornelius Doremus was appointed her executor with directions to sell the property and divide the proceeds among certain legatees. Some of these have died and their heirs claim their interest, and in this way the thirty-eight have taken possession.

The executor in 1890 tried to sell the property, but could not, owing to the outstanding claim of the defendants. The defendants claim that in 1851 John Magee, the owner, died, and left a life interest in it to his daughter, Mary. His widow was appointed guardian. The widow remarried, and under the name of Elizabeth Newell she bought a mortgage on the property, the defendants claim. Subsequently she gave Martha Doremus the deed under which the complainants claim the property. The daughter married, and now, as Mary Dunham, with her children, claims the property. She states that her mother simply held the property in trust for her, and that the trust still attaches to her.

That Mrs. Newell defrauded her daughter, or that there was any trust in her favor, is denied by the complainants. They have had possession of the property since 1850. The thirty-eight who have possession of the property came from Paterson, Union Hill and Morristown, N. J., Davenport, O., Chicago and Fort Magin, Mont. The complainants claim that their title comes from a deed for the property given by Elizabeth Newell to Martha Doremus in 1839. Martha Doremus died in 1882. Cornelius Doremus was appointed her executor with directions to sell the property and divide the proceeds among certain legatees. Some of these have died and their heirs claim their interest, and in this way the thirty-eight have taken possession.

The executor in 1890 tried to sell the property, but could not, owing to the outstanding claim of the defendants. The defendants claim that in 1851 John Magee, the owner, died, and left a life interest in it to his daughter, Mary. His widow was appointed guardian. The widow remarried, and under the name of Elizabeth Newell she bought a mortgage on the property, the defendants claim. Subsequently she gave Martha Doremus the deed under which the complainants claim the property. The daughter married, and now, as Mary Dunham, with her children, claims the property. She states that her mother simply held the property in trust for her, and that the trust still attaches to her.

That Mrs. Newell defrauded her daughter, or that there was any trust in her favor, is denied by the complainants. They have had possession of the property since 1850. The thirty-eight who have possession of the property came from Paterson, Union Hill and Morristown, N. J., Davenport, O., Chicago and Fort Magin, Mont. The complainants claim that their title comes from a deed for the property given by Elizabeth Newell to Martha Doremus in 1839. Martha Doremus died in 1882. Cornelius Doremus was appointed her executor with directions to sell the property and divide the proceeds among certain legatees. Some of these have died and their heirs claim their interest, and in this way the thirty-eight have taken possession.

The executor in 1890 tried to sell the property, but could not, owing to the outstanding claim of the defendants. The defendants claim that in 1851 John Magee, the owner, died, and left a life interest in it to his daughter, Mary. His widow was appointed guardian. The widow remarried, and under the name of Elizabeth Newell she bought a mortgage on the property, the defendants claim. Subsequently she gave Martha Doremus the deed under which the complainants claim the property. The daughter married, and now, as Mary Dunham, with her children, claims the property. She states that her mother simply held the property in trust for her, and that the trust still attaches to her.

That Mrs. Newell defrauded her daughter, or that there was any trust in her favor, is denied by the complainants. They have had possession of the property since 1850. The thirty-eight who have possession of the property came from Paterson, Union Hill and Morristown, N. J., Davenport, O., Chicago and Fort Magin, Mont. The complainants claim that their title comes from a deed for the property given by Elizabeth Newell to Martha Doremus in 1839. Martha Doremus died in 1882. Cornelius Doremus was appointed her executor with directions to sell the property and divide the proceeds among certain legatees. Some of these have died and their heirs claim their interest, and in this way the thirty-eight have taken possession.

The executor in 1890 tried to sell the property, but could not, owing to the outstanding claim of the defendants. The defendants claim that in 1851 John Magee, the owner, died, and left a life interest in it to his daughter, Mary. His widow was appointed guardian. The widow remarried, and under the name of Elizabeth Newell she bought a mortgage on the property, the defendants claim. Subsequently she gave Martha Doremus the deed under which the complainants claim the property. The daughter married, and now, as Mary Dunham, with her children, claims the property. She states that her mother simply held the property in trust for her, and that the trust still attaches to her.

That Mrs. Newell defrauded her daughter, or that there was any trust in her favor, is denied by the complainants. They have had possession of the property since 1850. The thirty-eight who have possession of the property came from Paterson, Union Hill and Morristown, N. J., Davenport, O., Chicago and Fort Magin, Mont. The complainants claim that their title comes from a deed for the property given by Elizabeth Newell to Martha Doremus in 1839. Martha Doremus died in 1882. Cornelius Doremus was appointed her executor with directions to sell the property and divide the proceeds among certain legatees. Some of these have died and their heirs claim their interest, and in this way the thirty-eight have taken possession.

The executor in 1890 tried to sell the property, but could not, owing to the outstanding claim of the defendants. The defendants claim that in 1851 John Magee, the owner, died, and left a life interest in it to his daughter, Mary. His widow was appointed guardian. The widow remarried, and under the name of Elizabeth Newell she bought a mortgage on the property, the defendants claim. Subsequently she gave Martha Doremus the deed under which the complainants claim the property. The daughter married, and now, as Mary Dunham, with her children, claims the property. She states that her mother simply held the property in trust for her, and that the trust still attaches to her.

That Mrs. Newell defrauded her daughter, or that there was any trust in her favor, is denied by the complainants. They have had possession of the property since 1850. The thirty-eight who have possession of the property came from Paterson, Union Hill and Morristown, N. J., Davenport, O., Chicago and Fort Magin, Mont. The complainants claim that their title comes from a deed for the property given by Elizabeth Newell to Martha Doremus in 1839. Martha Doremus died in 1882. Cornelius Doremus was appointed her executor with directions to sell the property and divide the proceeds among certain legatees. Some of these have died and their heirs claim their interest, and in this way the thirty-eight have taken possession.

The executor in 1890 tried to sell the property, but could not, owing to the outstanding claim of the defendants. The defendants claim that in 1851 John Magee, the owner, died, and left a life interest in it to his daughter, Mary. His widow was appointed guardian. The widow remarried, and under the name of Elizabeth Newell she bought a mortgage on the property, the defendants claim. Subsequently she gave Martha Doremus the deed under which the complainants claim the property. The daughter married, and now, as Mary Dunham, with her children, claims the property. She states that her mother simply held the property in trust for her, and that the trust still attaches to her.

That Mrs. Newell defrauded her daughter, or that there was any trust in her favor, is denied by the complainants. They have had possession of the property since 1850. The thirty-eight who have possession of the property came from Paterson, Union Hill and Morristown, N. J., Davenport, O., Chicago and Fort Magin, Mont. The complainants claim that their title comes from a deed for the property given by Elizabeth Newell to Martha Doremus in 1839. Martha Doremus died in 1882. Cornelius Doremus was appointed her executor with directions to sell the property and divide the proceeds among certain legatees. Some of these have died and their heirs claim their interest, and in this way the thirty-eight have taken possession.

The executor in 1890 tried to sell the property, but could not, owing to the outstanding claim of the defendants. The defendants claim that in 1851 John Magee, the owner, died, and left a life interest in it to his daughter, Mary. His widow was appointed guardian. The widow remarried, and under the name of Elizabeth Newell she bought a mortgage on the property, the defendants claim. Subsequently she gave Martha Doremus the deed under which the complainants claim the property. The daughter married, and now, as Mary Dunham, with her children, claims the property. She states that her mother simply held the property in trust for her, and that the trust still attaches to her.

That Mrs. Newell defrauded her daughter, or that there was any trust in her favor, is denied by the complainants. They have had possession of the property since 1850. The thirty-eight who have possession of the property came from Paterson, Union Hill and Morristown, N. J., Davenport, O., Chicago and Fort Magin, Mont. The complainants claim that their title comes from a deed for the property given by Elizabeth Newell to Martha Doremus in 1839. Martha Doremus died in 1882. Cornelius Doremus was appointed her executor with directions to sell the property and divide the proceeds among certain legatees. Some of these have died and their heirs claim their interest, and in this way the thirty-eight have taken possession.

The executor in 1890 tried to sell the property, but could not, owing to the outstanding claim of the defendants. The defendants claim that in 1851 John Magee, the owner, died, and left a life interest in it to his daughter, Mary. His widow was appointed guardian. The widow remarried, and under the name of Elizabeth Newell she bought a mortgage on the property, the defendants claim. Subsequently she gave Martha Doremus the deed under which the complainants claim the property. The daughter married, and now, as Mary Dunham, with her children, claims the property. She states that her mother simply held the property in trust for her, and that the trust still attaches to her.

That Mrs. Newell defrauded her daughter, or that there was any trust in her favor, is denied by the complainants. They have had possession of the property since 1850. The thirty-eight who have possession of the property came from Paterson, Union Hill and Morristown, N. J., Davenport, O., Chicago and Fort Magin, Mont. The complainants claim that their title comes from a deed for the property given by Elizabeth Newell to Martha Doremus in 1839. Martha Doremus died in 1882. Cornelius Doremus was appointed her executor with directions to sell the property and divide the proceeds among certain legatees. Some of these have died and their heirs claim their interest, and in this way the thirty-eight have taken possession.

The executor in 1890 tried to sell the property, but could not, owing to the outstanding claim of the defendants. The defendants claim that in 1851 John Magee, the owner, died, and left a life interest in it to his daughter, Mary. His widow was appointed guardian. The widow remarried, and under the name of Elizabeth Newell she bought a mortgage on the property, the defendants claim. Subsequently she gave Martha Doremus the deed under which the complainants claim the property. The daughter married, and now, as Mary Dunham, with her children, claims the property. She states that her mother simply held the property in trust for her, and that the trust still attaches to her.

That Mrs. Newell defrauded her daughter, or that there was any trust in her favor, is denied by the complainants. They have had possession of the property since 1850. The thirty-eight who have possession of the property came from Paterson, Union Hill and Morristown, N. J., Davenport, O., Chicago and Fort Magin, Mont. The complainants claim that their title comes from a deed for the property given by Elizabeth Newell to Martha Doremus in 1839. Martha Doremus died in 1882. Cornelius Doremus was appointed her executor with directions to sell the property and divide the proceeds among certain legatees. Some of these have died and their heirs claim their interest, and in this way the thirty-eight have taken possession.

The executor in 1890 tried to sell the property, but could not, owing to the outstanding claim of the defendants. The defendants claim that in 1851 John Magee, the owner, died, and left a life interest in it to his daughter, Mary. His widow was appointed guardian. The widow remarried, and under the name of Elizabeth Newell she bought a mortgage on the property, the defendants claim. Subsequently she gave Martha Doremus the deed under which the complainants claim the property. The daughter married, and now, as Mary Dunham, with her children, claims the property. She states that her mother simply held the property in trust for her, and that the trust still attaches to her.